

REMARKS

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 through 5, 8 through 11, 14, 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over FLAMINI et al. in view of GRIESAU et al. Claims 6, 7, 21 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over FLAMINI et al. in view of GRIESAU et al., further in view of WHITE et al. and further in view of FANG. Claims 12 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over FLAMINI et al. in view of GRIESAU et al., in further view of LIN. Claim 15 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over FLAMINI et al. in view of GRIESAU et al., and further in view of SHEN et al. Applicant respectfully traverses.

With the present Submission, claims 1 and 21 have been amended to clarify that the user input device/remote control has some buttons assigned to deck control and other buttons assigned to telestration. The graphics application telestrates in response to user input of telestration buttons. The device remote control application/input control application controls the dissimilar video playback input sources in response to user commands from the deck control buttons. Moreover, the claims now recite controlling the video playback input sources via wireless and wireline connectors.

It is submitted that none of the applied references, either alone or in the Examiner's proposed combinations suggest or render obvious the pending claims. For example, none of the applied references teach or suggest a remote control/user input device having both telestration buttons and deck control buttons. Moreover, none of the applied references teach controlling video playback input sources via both wireless and wireline connections. Thus, for at least these reasons, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner indicate the allowability of claims 1 and 21.

Dependent claims 2-17 and 22 are also believed to recite further patentable subject matter and therefore are also believed allowable over the prior art. Accordingly,

applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the outstanding rejections and indication of the allowability of all the claims of the present application.

Any amendment to the claims that have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto. Support for the amendments is provided throughout the specification, including paragraphs 27, 31, 34, 39, 43, 78, 89, 90, and Fig. 2.

Applicant is submitting a new Power of Attorney, along with a Statement Under 3.73(b), in response to the Notice Regarding Power of Attorney.


Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below listed telephone number.

The Director is authorized to charge any additional fee(s) or any underpayment of fee(s), or to credit any overpayments to Deposit Account **50-0337**. Please ensure that Attorney Docket No. 7789-101/10610366 is referred to when charging any payments or credits for this case.

Respectfully submitted,
David R. Tomlinson et al.

Dated: October 30, 2006

By



Alan M. Lenkin
Reg. No. 40,063

Customer No. 000167
Fulbright & Jaworski L.L.P.
555 South Flower Street
Forty-First Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Phone: (213) 892-9237
Fax: (213) 892-9494
E-mail: alenkin@fulbright.com